

**In the Drawings**

Kindly replace the current drawing sheet including Figure 26, with the replacement sheet enclosed herewith.

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-20 and 22-35 are pending. Claim 35 was added to replace canceled claim 21.

Entry of the amendment is respectfully requested. No new matter has been added.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

### **Claim Status**

Claims 32-34 were allowed.

Claims 22-31 were indicated allowable if written in an independent format. Claim 22 has been placed into an independent format, as requested by the Office. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 22 is now allowable. Claims 23-31 depend on claim 22 and are thus likewise allowable.

Claims 1-3, 5-7 and 15-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Watari (US 2001/0003345) in view of Sawada (US 5,835,816).

Claims 8-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Watari in view of Sawada and Graef (US 2002/0036159).

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Watari in view of Sawada and Howard (US 2002/0126849).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections. Nevertheless, claims have been amended to advance prosecution.

### **The Amendment**

#### **Claim 1**

Claim 1 was amended to substantially correspond to allowed claim 32. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is now allowable. Claims 2-17 depend on claim 1 and are thus likewise allowable.

### **Claim 18**

Claim 18 was amended in view of the Examiner's helpful comments. Neither Watari nor Sawada is directed to receipt jams, especially a receipt jam in an automated banking machine. Sawada is directed to prediction of errors in paper copy machines (e.g., col. 2, lines 16-23). Thus, Sawada is non analogous art. Nevertheless, Sawada does not send a second receipt while a jammed first receipt remains. Rather, Sawada conventionally teaches that an operator of the copy machine removes a jammed sheet (e.g., col. 5, lines 53-58) before another sheet is sent.

The Office has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Nor would it have been obvious to have combined the references in the manner alleged to have produced the recited invention of claim 18. The additional features and relationships in dependent claims 19-20 and 35 further patentably distinguish these claims over the applied art.

### **Replacement Drawing Sheet**

A typographical error was noted in the description of Step 550. The replacement sheet corrects the typographical error. No new matter has been added.

### **Conclusion**

Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. The undersigned is willing to discuss any aspect of the Application at the Office's convenience.

Respectfully submitted,



Ralph E. Jocke      Reg. No. 31,029  
WALKER & JOCKE  
231 South Broadway  
Medina, Ohio 44256  
(330) 721-0000